

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-37 remain pending herein.

The Applicants thank Vicki Wu, Examiner in Group Art Unit 1791, for the courtesies extended during a telephonic interview conducted on December 7, 2010. The substance of the discussion during that interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

In the August 20, 2010 Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 12, 13, 15-19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,356,496 (Lincoln '496).

Claim 1 recites a web splicer that comprises a first roll supporter, a second roll supporter, a paster roll, a carriage driving device and a pressing device. Claim 1 further recites that the paster roll is mounted on a carriage, is rotatable about its axis, and that its axis is movable relative to the carriage. Claim 1 also recite that the carriage driving device causes the carriage to move from a first carriage position to a second carriage position (where the paster roll abuts a roll on the second roll supporter) after an engage signal is fed to said carriage driving device. Claim 1 further recites that the pressing device selectively causes force to be applied to the paster roll relative to the carriage.

Claim 1 is amended as set forth above to make a revision as discussed during the December 7, 2010 interview, to recite that the paster roll *axis* is movable relative to the carriage.

Lincoln '496 discloses an embodiment of a splice tail tape-down apparatus that includes a splicer or paster roll 90 (see Fig. 15) which is actuated by a cylinder 92 in the act of pressing a progressing web 11 against a fresh roll 15 and causing a splice to be made between the web 11 and the web 20.

During the December 7, 2010 interview, the Applicants stated that Lincoln '496 discloses a piston/cylinder arrangement, in which the paster roll 90 moves with the piston and

the cylinder 92 does not move, and the Applicants argued that if the piston of Lincoln '496 is compared with a carriage recited in claim 1, Lincoln '496 does not disclose a device in which a paster roll is mounted on a movable carriage with the paster roll being movable relative to that carriage. In response to this argument, Examiner Wu indicated that the USPTO's position is that rotation of the paster roll 90 about its axis (in Lincoln '496) constitutes movement of the paster roll relative to the piston, such that the paster roll 90 is "movable relative to" the piston.

During the December 7, 2010 interview, the Applicants and Examiner Wu discussed amending the claims to recite that the paster roll *axis* is movable relative to the carriage. This amendment is made above in the three independent claims pending in this application, namely, claims 1, 17 and 26. Lincoln '496 does not disclose or suggest a device in which a paster roll is mounted on a movable carriage, and the axis of the paster roll is movable relative to that carriage, as recited in each of claims 1, 17 and 26. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Lincoln '496.

In addition, Claims 2-4, 6, 12, 13, 15 and 16 each depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, and therefore are patentable over Lincoln '496 for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is patentable over Lincoln '496, as discussed above.

Claim 17 recites a web splicer that comprises a first roll supporter, a second roll supporter, a paster roll mounted on a carriage, means for moving the carriage from a first carriage position to a second carriage position, and means for applying pressure on the paster roll against the second roll when the carriage is in the second carriage position. Claim 17 further recites that the paster roll is rotatable about an axis, and that the paster roll axis is movable relative to the carriage. Claim 17 also recites that the paster roll abuts the second roll when the carriage is in the second carriage position.

As noted above, Lincoln '496 does not disclose or suggest a device in which a paster roll is mounted on a movable carriage and in which its axis is movable relative to that carriage. Accordingly, Lincoln '496 does not disclose or suggest a device that comprises (1) a paster roll that is mounted on a carriage and whose axis is movable relative to that carriage, and (2) means for moving the carriage from a first carriage position to a second carriage position.

Accordingly, Claim 17 is patentable over Lincoln '496.

Claims 18, 19 and 21 depend directly or indirectly from claim 17 and are therefore patentable over Lincoln '496 for at least the same reasons that claim 17 is patentable over Lincoln '496, as discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the United States Patent and Trademark Office reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 5 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lincoln '496 in view of U.S. Patent 6,096,150 (hereinafter, "Ohno '150").

Ohno '150 is cited for alleged disclosure of a carriage which moves "from a second carriage position to a first carriage position after a disengage signal is fed to the carriage driving device" (Office Action dated December 23, 2009, Page 7). The U.S. PTO does not assert that Ohno '150 would have made it obvious to modify Lincoln '496 to provide a device in which a paster roll is mounted on a movable carriage and in which the paster roll axis is movable relative to the carriage, as recited in claim 1, or that comprises (1) a paster roll that is mounted on a carriage and whose axis is movable relative to that carriage, and (2) means for moving the carriage from a first position to a second position, as recited in claim 17. Accordingly, any disclosure in Ohno '150, as alleged in the Office Action, would not

overcome the shortcomings of Lincoln '496 as attempted to be applied by the U.S. PTO against Claim 1, from which Claim 5 depends, or likewise of Claim 17, from which Claim 20 depends. Accordingly, Claims 5 and 20 are patentable over the applied references.

It is respectfully requested that the United States Patent and Trademark Office reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lincoln '496 in view of U.S. Patent 6,050,517 (hereinafter, "Dobrescu '517").

Dobrescu '517 is cited for alleged disclosure of gears rotatable in clockwise and counter-clockwise directions, the gears causing a carriage to move, a servo motor which drives the gears, a cam, and a rack. Any such disclosure in Dobrescu '517 would not overcome the shortcomings of Lincoln '496 as attempted to be applied by the U.S. PTO against Claims 1 and 17. Hence, Claims 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, (which ultimately depend from Claim 1), and Claims 22, 23, 24 and 25 (which ultimately depend from Claim 17) are patentable over the applied references, and it is respectfully requested that the United States Patent and Trademark Office reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lincoln '496 in view of U.S. Patent 4,543,152 (hereinafter, "Nozaka '152").

Nozaka '152 is relied upon by the U.S. PTO for alleged disclosure of a pulse generator and a pulse counter. Any such disclosure in Nozaka '152 would not overcome the shortcomings of Lincoln '496 as attempted to be applied by the U.S. PTO against Claim 1, from which Claim 14 depends. Accordingly, Claim 14 is patentable over the applied

references, and it is respectfully requested that the United States Patent and Trademark Office reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 26 - 31 and 36 - 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lincoln '496.

Independent claim 26 recites a method of splicing a second web to a first web, the method comprising:

unwinding a first web from a first roll;

rotating a second roll, the second roll comprising a second web wound around a second core, the second web having a splice region on an external portion of the second roll;

actuating a pressing device to cause force to be applied to a paster roll relative to a carriage, the paster roll being mounted on the carriage, the paster roll having an axis that is movable relative to the carriage; and

moving the carriage from a first carriage position to a second carriage position upon receiving an engage signal, whereby a portion of the first web is sandwiched between the paster roll and the second roll at a contact location.

Claim 26 further recites that a force applied to the first web between the paster roll and the second roll is controlled by force applied by the pressing device.

Claim 26 also recites that when the splice region passes through the contact location, the second web becomes attached to the first web along the splice region.

As discussed above, Lincoln '496 does not disclose or suggest a device in which a paster roll is mounted on a movable carriage, and the paster roll has an axis that is movable relative to that carriage. Accordingly, Lincoln '496 does not disclose or suggest a method that comprises:

actuating a pressing device to cause force to be applied to a paster roll relative to a carriage, the paster roll being mounted on the carriage, the paster roll having an axis that is movable relative to the carriage; and

moving the carriage from a first carriage position to a second carriage position,  
as recited in claim 26.

Accordingly, claim 26 is patentable over Lincoln '496.

In addition, claims 27-31, 36 and 37 each depend directly or indirectly from claim 26, and are therefore patentable over Lincoln '496 for at least the same reasons that claim 26 is patentable over Lincoln '496, as discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the United States Patent and Trademark Office reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 32, 33, 34, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lincoln '496 in view of Dobrescu '517.

Dobrescu '517 is cited by the U.S. PTO for alleged disclosure of gears rotatable in clockwise and counter-clockwise directions, the gears causing a carriage to move, a servo motor which drives the gears, a cam, and a rack. Any such disclosure in Dobrescu '517 would not overcome the shortcomings of Lincoln '496 as attempted to be applied by the U.S. PTO against Claim 26. Hence, Claims 32, 33, 34, and 35 are patentable over the applied references. It is respectfully requested that the United States Patent and Trademark Office reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

In view of the above, Claims 1 - 37 are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call Applicants' attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,

December 20, 2010

Date



Kevin C. Brown  
Reg. No. 32,402

KCB/jms

BURR & BROWN  
P.O. Box 7068  
Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191  
Telephone: (315) 233-8300  
Facsimile: (315) 233-8320